

REMARKS

This Response is in reply to the Office Action dated June 4, 2007. A one (1) month extension of time is filed herewith. Therefore, the time period for response extends up to and includes October 4, 2007. Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for his careful review and consideration of this application.

In the subject Action, claims 1-16 were rejected. Claims 1-16 remain pending in the present application. In light of the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections and advancement of this application to allowance.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-9 and 12-16 were rejected under §103(a) as being obvious over the admitted prior art (APA) in view of *Smith et al.* (U.S. Pub. No. 2001/0047263). Claims 10 and 11 were rejected as being obvious over APA in view of *Smith et al.* and in further view of *Bellegarda et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,285,785). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Claim 1 recites, among other limitations, that a voice interactive method includes “d) simultaneous with step b), calculating an idle time between a current input voice signal and a previous input voice signal” and “e) disabling the semantic recognition of the input voice signal, and repeating step a) when the idle time calculated in step d) is larger than a predetermined threshold.” In other words, semantic recognition upon the input voice signal and calculation of an idle time between the current input voice signal and a previous input voice signal are performed simultaneously. In addition, the semantic recognition of the input voice signal is disabled and step a) is repeated when the idle time calculated in step d) is larger than a predetermined threshold.

In contrast, as admitted by the Office Action, APA fails to disclose or suggest any of the above features (steps d) and e)) recited in claim 1.

Smith et al. also fails to disclose any of steps d) and step e) recited in claim 1 of the present application. Rather, *Smith et al.* discloses that a phone system 1100 awaits an attention word or key input, such as a verbal keyword or a pressed key (step 600). Once the key is recognized, the system 1100 acknowledges by presenting various operation choices for selection

by the user (step 615). Subsequently, the system 1100 enters a wait state waiting for a command (step 620). See, e.g., paras. 0056-0057. If, after a predetermined amount of time, no command is received from the user (step 650), the system 1100 will remind the user to provide a command (655). If no command is received again within the predetermined amount of time (step 650), the system 1100 will go back to step 600 to await another attention word or key. See, e.g., para. 0060. In other words, step 620 in *Smith et al.* merely awaits a command from the user. The time in *Smith et al.* is calculated upon the initiation of the wait state without reference to a previous input voice signal. Therefore, *Smith et al.* fails to disclose or suggest “calculating an idle time between a current input voice signal and a previous input voice signal” as recited in claim 1 of the present application. (emphasis added) Further, *Smith et al.* fails to disclose or suggest that the semantic recognition remains enable until the calculated idle time is larger than the predetermined threshold.

Therefore, even if it is proper to combine APA and *Smith et al.* (which point Applicant does not concede), the combination fails to disclose or suggest the steps d) and e) recited in claim 1 of the present application. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the pending rejection. Claim 1 should be allowable.

Similarly, as to independent claims 5, 6, 12 and 13, claim 5 recites, among other limitations, that a selective voice recognition method includes “c) simultaneous with step b), calculating an idle time between a current input voice signal and a previous input voice signal” and “d) disabling the semantic recognition of the input voice signal, and repeating step a) when the idle time calculated in step c) is larger than a predetermined threshold.”

Claim 6 recites, among other limitations, that a voice interactive system includes “a timer module which operates simultaneously with operation of said semantic recognition module in the enabled mode so as to calculate an idle time between a current input voice signal and a previous input voice signal, and so as to determine whether the idle time calculated thereby is larger than a predetermined threshold” and “a mode switching module coupled to said timer module and said detecting module, said mode switching module enabling said detecting module to switch operation of said semantic recognition module from the enabled mode back to the disabled mode upon detection by said timer module that the idle time between the current input voice signal and the previous input voice signal is larger than the predetermined threshold.”

Claim 12 recites, among other limitations, that a selective voice recognition system includes “a timer module which operates simultaneously with operation of said semantic recognition module in the enabled mode so as to calculate an idle time between a current input voice signal and a previous input voice signal, and so as to determine whether the idle time calculated thereby is larger than a predetermined threshold” and “a mode switching module coupled to said timer module and said detecting module, said mode switching module enabling said detecting module to switch operation of said semantic recognition module from the enabled mode back to the disabled mode upon detection by said timer module that the idle time between the current input voice signal and the previous input voice signal is larger than the predetermined threshold.”

Claim 13 recites, among other limitations, that an electronic device includes “a timer module which operates simultaneously with operation of said semantic recognition module in the enabled mode so as to calculate an idle time between a current input voice signal and a previous input voice signal, and so as to determine whether the idle time calculated thereby is larger than a predetermined threshold” and “a mode switching module coupled to said timer module and said detecting module, said mode switching module enabling said detecting module to switch operation of said semantic recognition module from the enabled mode back to the disabled mode upon detection by said timer module that the idle time between the current input voice signal and the previous input voice signal is larger than the predetermined threshold.”

For at least reasons similar to those advanced above for the patentability of claim 1, claims 5, 6, 12 and 13 are also patentable.

Claims 2-4, 7-11 and 14-16 depend (directly or indirectly) from an independent claim of claims 1, 6 and 13 and include all of the elements of the independent claim, which is patentable because of at least the reasons stated above. Therefore, dependent claims 2-4, 7-11 and 14-16 are allowable. Applicant does not otherwise concede the correctness of the rejections and reserves the right to make additional arguments as may be necessary.

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the pending rejections.

Conclusion


This response is believed to be responsive to all points raised in the Office Action. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the currently pending claims. Should the Examiner have any remaining questions or concerns, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned attorney at 612.336.4611 to discuss the same.

Respectfully submitted,



MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
(612) 332-5300

Dated: October 3, 2007

By 
Tong Wu
Reg. No. 43,361